# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

Ťo:				PCT		
	•					
see form PCT/ISA/220				WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY		
		•		(PCT Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1)		
			Date of mailing (day/month/yea	ar) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)		
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220				FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
International application No. International filing d. PCT/US2007/024126 19.11.2007			e (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 22.11.2006		
	ational Patent Classification (IPC) or t G01N27/414	ooth national classificat	ion and IPC			
Applic PRE	cant SIDENT AND FELLOWS OF I	HARVARD COLLE	GE			
1.	This opinion contains Indication	ons relating to the	following items:			
	Box No. I Basis of the op	inion				
	☐ Box No. II Priority					
		· .	egard to novelty, i	nventive step and industrial applicability		
	Box No. IV / Lack of unity o	•				
	Box No. V Reasoned state applicability; ci	ement under Hule 43 tations and explanati	ons supporting su	gard to novelty, inventive step or industrial ch statement		
	Box No. VI Certain docum					
	•	in the international				
	☐ Box No. VIII Certain observ	ations on the interna	tional application			
2.	FURTHER ACTION		•			
	written opinion of the Internation the applicant chooses an Author	al Preliminary Exami ity other than this on	ning Authority ("IP e to be the IPEA a	ion will usually be considered to be a EA") except that this does not apply where nd the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Searching Authority		
	submit to the IPEA a written repl	y together, where ap	propriate, with am	of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to endments, before the expiration of 3 months f 22 months from the priority date,		
i	For further options, see Form PC	CT/ISA/220.	· .	•		
3.	For further details, see notes to 1	Form PCT/ISA/220.	•			
			•			
Name	and mailing address of the ISA:	Date of this of	of completion of pinion	Authorized Officer		
	European Patent Office - P.B.			Wilhelm, Jörg		
<u> </u>	NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 3		SA/210			
· ·	Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016			Telephone No. +31 70 340-2633		

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2007/024126

-	Box	c No	o. I	Basis of the opInIon
1.	Wit	h re	gard	to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	Ø	the	e inte	ernational application in the language in which it was filed
		a t pu	rans	station of the international application into , which is the language of a translation furnished for the ses of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).
2.		Th by	is of or n	pinion has been established taking into account the rectification of an obvious mistake authorized notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))
3.	Wit	h re :ess	gard ary	to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a. t	ype	of n	naterial:
	1		a s	equence listing
	.		tab	le(s) related to the sequence listing
	b. f	orm	at o	f material:
	1		on	paper
			In e	electronic form
	c. t	ime	of fi	iling/furnishing:
	.		cor	ntained in the international application as filed.
			file	d together with the international application in electronic form.
	٠. ا	Ò	furi	nished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
4.	<b>D</b> .	ha co	is be	lition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto sen filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional is is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as oriate, were furnished.

5. Additional comments:

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability						
The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of						
	the entire international application					
☒	claims Nos. <u>3-5.28</u>					
because:						
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (specify):					
	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):					
. 🗆	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):					
×	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 3-5,28					
	a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:					
	In turnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.					
	furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.					
	pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13 ter. 1(a) or (b).					
;	a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.					
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.					
. 🗆	See Supplemental Box for further details					

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

<u> 20-26</u>

No: Claims

1,2,6-19,27,29-32

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1,2,6-27;29-32

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1,2,6-27,29-32

Nó: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

#### Re Item V.

- 1. Reference is made to the following documents:
  - D1: US 2002/117659 A1 (LIEBER CHARLES M [US] ET AL) 29 August 2002 (2002-08-29) cited in the application
  - D2: WANG W U ET AL: "Label-free detection of small-molecule-protein interactions by using nanowire nanosensors", PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF USA, vol. 102, no. 9, 1 March 2005 (2005-03-01), pages 3208-3212, XP002478997, ISSN: 0027-8424
- 2. Clarity Article 6 PCT
- 2.1. Claims 1 and 27 define a feature using the expression "Debye screening length" in an unusual context. Normally, this expression relates to electrolytes (see p. 8, l. 10-25 of the present application), but not to semiconductors. Hence, this expression does not have a well-recognised meaning for a nanowire, and the definition given on p. 7, l. 30 p. 8, l. 9 of the description has to be included in the claims in order to overcome this lack of clarity.
- 2.2. Furthermore, it is clear from the description that neither the "Debye screening length" being greater than the nanowire diameter nor its non-linear response are inherent features of the nanowire (the nanowire in the described embodiment has a doping level B:Si of 1:8000, which leads to a "Debye screening length of much less than its diameter of 10 nm).
  - Said claimed features as in fact results of the gate voltage being tuned to a certain value. Since independent claims 1, 2 and 27 do not contain this feature of tuning the gate voltage, they do not meet the requirement following from Article 6 PCT taken in combination with Rule 6.3(b) PCT that any independent claim must contain all the technical features essential to the definition of the invention.

- 3. Independent claims 1, 2 and 27
- 3.1. Given the above lack of clarity, the subject-matter of the independent claims is anticipated by document D1, which discloses a nanowire with a very low doping concentration (par. [0091]: 1 ppm). Using the formula given on p. 8 of the present application, one obtains a "Debye screening length" greater than 10 nm, thus greater than some of the diameters mentioned (par. [0063]). Even though such a combination is not actually recommended in D1 (par. [0155] and Figs. 14a, 14b), it is nevertheless disclosed.
  Hence, the subject-matter of claims 1 and 27 is not new with respect to D1.
  Furthermore, the subject-matter of claim 2 is not new, because its subject-matter is a direct consequence of said feature combination in D1.
- 3.2 The subject-matter of claim 27 is also not new with respect to document D2, which discloses a nanowire with a doping level B:Si of 1:4000, thus a natural "Debye screening length" of less than its diameter (20 nm). However, this nanowire can certainly be operated with a gate voltage that depletes its carrier concentration, thus leading to a higher "Debye screening length".

### 4. Dependent claims

Dependent claims 6-26 and 29-32 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step.

Possible steps after receipt of the international search report (ISR) and written opinion of the International Searching Authority (WO-ISA)

### General information

For all international applications filed on or after 01/01/2004 the competent ISA will establish an ISR. It is accompanied by the WO-ISA. Unlike the former written opinion of the IPEA (Rule 66.2 PCT), the WO-ISA is not meant to be responded to, but to be taken into consideration for further procedural steps. This document explains about the possibilities.

# under Art. 19 PCT

Amending claims Within 2 months after the date of mailing of the ISR and the WO-ISA the applicant may file amended claims under Art. 19 PCT directly with the International Bureau of WIPO. The PCT reform of 2004 did not change this procedure. For further information please see Rule 46 PCT as well as form PCT/ISA/220 and the corresponding Notes to form PCT/ISA/220.

### Filing a demand for international preliminary examination

In principle, the WO-ISA will be considered as the written opinion of the IPEA. This should, in many cases, make it unnecessary to file a demand for international preliminary examination. If the applicant nevertheless wishes to file a demand this must be done before expiry of 3 months after the date of mailing of the ISR/WO-ISA or 22 months after priority date, whichever expires later (Rule 54bis PCT). Amendments under Art. 34 PCT can be filed with the IPEA as before, normally at the same time as filing the demand (Rule 66.1 (b) PCT).

If a demand for international preliminary examination is filed and no comments/amendments have been received the WO-ISA will be transformed by the IPEA into an IPRP (International Preliminary Report on Patentability) which would merely reflect the content of the WO-ISA. The demand can still be withdrawn (Art. 37 PCT).

## Filing informal comments

After receipt of the ISP/WO-ISA the applicant may file informal comments on the WO-ISA directly with the International Bureau of WIPO. These will be communicated to the designated Offices together with the IPRP (International Preliminary Report on Patentability) at 30 months from the priority date. Please also refer to the next box.

## End of the international phase

At the end of the international phase the International Bureau of WIPO will transform the WO-ISA or, if a demand was filed, the written opinion of the IPEA into the IPPP, which will then be transmitted together with possible informal comments to the designated Offices. The IPRP replaces the former IPER (international preliminary examination report).

### Relevant PCT Rules and more information

Rule 43 PCT, Rule 43bis PCT, Rule 44 PCT, Rule 44bis PCT, PCT Newsletter 12/2003, OJ 11/2003, OJ 12/2003

Bitte beachten Sie, dass angeführte Nichtpatentliteratur (wie z.B. wissenschaftliche oder technische Dokumente) je nach geltendem Recht dem Urheberrechtsschutz und/oder anderen Schutzarten für schriftliche Werke unterliegen könnte. Die Vervielfältigung urheberrechtlich geschützter Texte, ihre Verwendung in anderen elektronischen oder gedruckten Publikationen und ihre Weitergabe an Dritte ist ohne ausdrückliche Zustimmung des Rechtsinhabers nicht gestattet.

Veuillez noter que les ouvrages de la littérature non-brevets qui sont cités, par exemple les documents scientifiques ou techniques, etc., peuvent être protégés par des droits d'auteur et/ou toute autre protection des écrits prévue par les législations applicables. Les textes ainsi protégés ne peuvent être reproduits ni utilisés dans d'autres publications électroniques ou imprimées, ni rediffusés sans l'autorisation expresse du titulaire du droit d'auteur.

Please be aware that cited works of non-patent literature such as scientific or technical documents or the like may be subject to copyright protection and/or any other protection of written works as appropriate based on applicable laws. Copyrighted texts may not be copied or used in other electronic or printed publications or re-distributed without the express permission of the copyright holder.